## Rights Theory

#### A: Interpretation- The affirmative must specify what type of right they defend when asked about it in cross ex if they have not specified within the 1AC. To clarify, the affirmative can say they defend a civil right, human right, etc. They cannot leave the question unanswered or simply defend a broad right.

#### B: Violation-

#### C: Standards

#### Ground- the word “right” can be an adjective, adverb, noun, verb, or exclamation- Their lack of specification makes the word “right” itself completely vague in the context it is being used. If the Affirmative cannot defend what type of right they are talking about, their entire advocacy becomes vaugue because then the neg cdoes not have sufficient DA or CP Ground, there’s no links to disads on hypothetical rights and no counterplans to an aff that defends a vague conception of a right. Ground controls the internal link to fairness since both sides must have a reciprocal path to the ballot.

#### Clash- the neg is not saying the aff is only allowed to specify one type of right, rather our interpretation says if they did specify a specific right, then we would have a more productive and indepth discussion. For example, if it’s a civil right we can talk about the legal intricacies and distinctions between how that civil right would be consitituted. If it’s a human right, we can have a discussion about what makes adolsecnets inherently worth as autonomous for just being humans. Either way, we can have better policy making-legal discussions or philosophical education if they specified which right they defend clash controls the internal link to education because for us to be able to have a real discussion there must be a point of contestation.

#### Voters:

#### Vote on education debate is different from other activities it is not about how strong you are physically rather how your mental capacity operates which means if they do something abusive to deny the best education that can happen than education should be your primary focus in the round

#### And, vote off fairness- procedural fairness matters in debate- if the round is not fair then the round is skewed- ballots are important to us in debate we should have a fair path to the ballot-

#### Discussions are only productive if they’re fair—the Aff excludes Neg arguments

**Galloway 2007** (Ryan Galloway, Samford Debate Coach, Professor of Communication Studies at Samford, Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, Vol. 28, 2007, LEQ)

**Affirmative cases that suspend basic fairness norms operate to exclude particular negative strategies**. Unprepared, **one side comes to the argumentative table unable to meaningfully participate in a dialogue**. They are unable to “understand what ‘went on…’” and are left to the whims of time and power (Farrell, 1985, p. 114). Hugh Duncan furthers this line of reasoning: **Opponents not only tolerate but honor and respect each other because in doing so they enhance their own chances of thinking better and reaching sound decisions. Opposition is necessary because it sharpens thought in action**. We assume that argument, discussion, and talk, among free an informed people who subordinate themselves to rules of discussion, are the best ways to decisions of any kind, because **it is only through such discussion that we reach agreement which binds us to a common cause…If we are to be equal…relationships among equals must find expression in many formal and informal institution**s (Duncan, 1993, p. 196-197). **Debate compensates for the exigencies of the world by offering a framework that maintains equality for the sake of the conversation** (Farrell, 1985, p. 114).

#### And, reject the argument since it makes the entirety of the round unfair and uneducational but if you reject their argument which is the advocacy you should drop the debater as well because if you reject their advocacy there is no reason to vote for the debater.

#### Use competing interps because it checks back against unclear reasonability claims by allowing the judge to clearly resolve the theory debate without having to gut check.

#### NO RVI’S

#### a) It undermines the point of reading theory to check abuse

#### b) It allows abusive affs to create incredibly unfair cases in order to bait theory

#### c) The aff holds the burden of fairness and therefore should not win for simply proving they are fair